

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-18 stand rejected.

Claim 19 has been newly added. This claim includes features supported by the specification and which are not suggested in the prior art. For example, allocating an IP address to a mobile node, said IP address being selected from one of a DHCP server, a first pool storing IP addresses, and a second pool storing IP addresses and a third module storing an IP address released from the mobile node in the second pool for a predetermined period of time.

No new matter is entered.

Claim 1 and 10 have been clarified and include the limitations of claims 2 and 11 respectively.

Applicant's claimed invention includes, for example:

(1) A home agent (100 in FIG. 1) is connected to a first network (500) that a mobile node (400) normally utilizes,

(2) Providing a DHCP server (200) that is connected the home agent via the first network and is an address lender,

(3) Detecting that lease addresses of the DHCP server and addresses pooled beforehand in the home agent are all occupied, and

(4) The home agent temporarily pools as self-managed information the address requested to be open by the mobile node without immediately returning the address to the DHCP server.

Claims 1-6, 9-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stammers et al., (U.S. 6,754,492) (Stammers). It's contended in the Office Action that Stammers teaches all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 10.

However Stammers teaches a number of mobility control functions (MCFs) that can register and continue to provide mobile services to mobile devices. A routing function may distribute registration requests received from mobile devices to a pool of MCFs to provide load sharing and redundancy capabilities. (col. 2, lines 14-28).

Therefore Stammers teaches a pool of MCFs but does not teach or suggest applicant's claimed lease addresses of a DHCP server and addresses pooled beforehand are all occupied.

The control functions are completely different from addresses.

In addition applicant claims searching for, when detecting that all the addresses are occupied, an address on the basis of self-managed information and allocating the searched address to said mobile node.

The Office action points to col. 4, lines 14-31. However this relates to load balancing across the MCFs and provides no indication of searching for an address. The reference teaches: "~~Core packet network 40 then receives the request from RNC 26 at a selected~~ MCF 42 within MCF pool 44. In a particular embodiment, the request is forwarded to the selected MCF 42 based on loading and/or redundancy characteristics. MCF 42 then communicates an authentication request for mobile device 22 to HLR/AUC 56."

Applicant also claims temporarily pooling as the self-managed information the address requested to be open by said mobile node without immediately returning the address to said DHCP server.

The Office action points to col. 2, lines 15-27. However, again this relates to a pool of MCFs not addresses. The references states "While registering a mobile device, each MCF may assign a temporary mobile device identifier (TMDI) that identifies the serving MCF. In this manner, components of the system may use the TMDI to route further messages from the mobile device to the serving MCF.

This is different from the home agent temporarily pooling the address requested to be opened by the mobile node.

The reference Stammers merely shows a communication system (10 in FIG. 1) that even if a mobile device (22) in a radio access network (RAN 20) moves in a control zone of a second base station (BS 24) from a first base station (BS 24), can provide a mobile communication (service) to the mobile device. In Stammers, it is necessary to frequently or always access to a mobility control function (MCF) pool (44) in the core packet network in order to provide the mobile communication to the mobile device that moves between the BSS.

Applicant's claimed invention recites distinguishable features as pointed out above which provides at least an advantage of a decrease both of the access count to the DHCP server and the first network (home network) traffic.

Claims 7-8 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stammers et al., in view of Pierce et al., (U.S. 5,666,364).


Each of dependent claims provides at least the distinguishable features as pointed out above which are not suggested in the combination of references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that applicant's claimed invention is distinguishable from the reference Stammers and is not obvious by the references Stammers and Pierce and the rejections should be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJY 19.282 (100794-00112)
BSM:fd